

REMARKS

Status of the Claims.

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 54-74 are pending and newly added. Claims 46 and 48 are canceled without disclaimer or prejudice to renewal. New claims 54, 64 and 74 are independent. Support for new claim 54 is found, *e.g.*, in paragraphs [0007-0008], [0024-0025], in Table 1, and in the Examples. Support for new claim 64 is found, *e.g.*, in paragraphs [0007-0008], in Table 1, and in the Examples. Support for new claim 74 is found, *e.g.*, in Table 1 and in the Examples. Support for new claims 55 and 65 is found, *e.g.*, in paragraphs [0007] and [0059]. Support for new claims 56 and 66 is found, *e.g.*, in paragraphs [0007], [0016], [0041] and [0069]. Support for new claims 57 and 67 is found, *e.g.*, in paragraphs [0014-0015], [0062], [0075-0076] and Figures 4 and 5. Support for new claims 58, 59, 60, 68, 69 and 70 is found, *e.g.*, in paragraph [0004]. Support for new claims 61 and 71 is found, *e.g.*, in paragraphs [0050], [0053] and [0056]. Support for new claims 62, 63, 72 and 73 is found, *e.g.*, in paragraph [0008] and Table 1. No new matter is added by the present amendments, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter them.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Claims 46 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,962,455 ("Blum"). Applicants do not agree with the Examiner's position. However, in the interest of furthering prosecution, claims 46 and 48 are canceled without disclaimer.

Blum also does not anticipate the methods of newly submitted claims 54-74. Blum describes urea compounds having aryl and heteroaryl groups corresponding to the R¹ and R³ radicals used in the sEH inhibitors of the present methods, where the aryl group, phenyl, is substituted with a methyl-1-(4-phenyl-1-piperazinyl)-cyclohexyl group. For the instant claims to encompass the Blum compounds, the "substituent" of the instant claims must encompass the methyl-1-(4-phenyl-1-piperazinyl)-cyclohexyl group of the Blum compounds.

The neuropeptide Y1 (NPY1) inhibitors described in Blum are structurally distinct from the inhibitors of sEH set forth in the methods of independent claims 54, 64 and 74. Claim 54 recites

particular alkyl, cycloalkyl, aryl and heteroaryl substituents for R^1 and R^3 not disclosed in Blum. As noted above, the substituent of the Blum compounds is a methyl-1-(4-phenyl-1-piperazinyl)-cyclohexyl group. The substituents of the aryl and heteroaryl groups in claim 54, however, do not include a phenyl, piperazine, or cycloalkyl group, much less the combination of these three into a single substituent such as methyl-1-(4-phenyl-1-piperazinyl)-cyclohexyl. Therefore, the NPY1 compounds of Blum are not encompassed by the method of claim 54.

Claim 64 recites wherein at least one of R^1 and R^3 is a substituted or unsubstituted alkyl or cycloalkyl. In contrast, Blum describes NPY1 inhibitor compounds that have either aryl, such as phenyl and naphthyl, or heteroaryl, such as quinoline and pyridyl, in the R^1 and R^3 positions. Because the Blum compounds do not include ureas with an alkyl or cycloalkyl group at the R^1 and R^3 positions, as recited in claim 64 for at least one of R^1 and R^3 , the Blum compounds are not encompassed by the method of claim 64.

Claim 74 recites that when R^1 is aryl, then R^3 is other than heteroaryl and aryl. As stated above, the NPY1 inhibitor compounds of Blum require either aryl, such as phenyl and naphthyl, or heteroaryl, such as quinoline and pyridyl, in the R^1 and R^3 positions. Because the Blum compounds do not include ureas wherein R^1 is aryl, then R^3 is other than heteroaryl and aryl, as recited in claim 74 for at least one of R^1 and R^3 , the Blum compounds are not encompassed by the method of claim 74.

Accordingly, the substituents of the aryl and heteroaryl groups in claim 54 do not include a phenyl, piperazine, or cycloalkyl group, or the combined methyl-1-(4-phenyl-1-piperazinyl)-cyclohexyl. Moreover, claims 64 and 74 exclude compounds wherein R^1 is aryl and R^3 is heteroaryl or aryl. Because Blum does not disclose or suggest the present methods of reducing blood pressure using the recited inhibitors of sEH, either expressly or inherently, Blum does not anticipate the claimed invention. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the present rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner seek to maintain the rejections, Applicants request a telephone interview with the Examiner and the Examiner's supervisor.

If a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (510) 267-4117.

Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP
500 12th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, CA 94607
Tel: (510) 663-1100
Fax: (510) 663-0920

Respectfully submitted,

/Jennifer L. Wahlsten/

Jennifer L. Wahlsten
Reg. No: 46,226